



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

col

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,065	12/19/2001	Adam Wayne Mehlberg	2001-067-TAP	9460

7590 06/06/2005
Wayne P. Bailey
Storage Technology Corporation
One StorageTek Drive
Louisville, CO 80028-4309

EXAMINER

KIM, AHSHIK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/034,065	Applicant(s) MEHLBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner Ahshik Kim	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/15/05 (Appeal Brief).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 15-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 15-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Appeal Brief

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Appeal Brief filed on February 15, 2005.

5

Finality Withdrawn

2. In careful review of the Appellant's appeal brief, especially the summary of invention and subsequent argument section, the finality of the office action (mailed out on October 5, 2004) is withdrawn.

10

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

15

4. Claims 1-10 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

20

Re claims 1, 15, and 16, Examiner finds the following phrase difficult to comprehend.

“an attenuation surface to the barcode scanner, wherein attenuation surface is located such that at least one end of scan path of the barcode scanner is controlled by the attenuation surface to form a controlled end of scan, and wherein the controlled end of scan is used to determine a location

25

Art Unit: 2876

of the attenuation surface with respect to a target associated with at least one storage cell within a storage library.”

It is difficult to find whether attenuation surface is to determine a controlled end of scan or the controlled end of scan determines a location of attenuation surface. In a simplistic sense, if there are two variables which drive each other, actual operation may be in an infinite loop, never reaching the optimal scan path. It is the Examiner’s opinion that the attenuation surface should determine controlled scan path. However, Examiner respectfully requests Applicant to clarify the claims or direct the Examiner in the specification if the subject matter actually functions as it is written in the claims.

Dependent claims 2-11, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because the independent claims on which these claims depend were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 23, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rockwell et al. (US 6,138,909, hereinafter “Rockwell”).

Re claims 23, 26, and 29, Rockwell teaches a robot (see figure 1; col. 1, lines 26+) comprising a gripper 22, a barcode scanner 26 providing a scan path which scans a barcode 28 affixed to the data cartridge processor 14 (col. 2, lines 35+), wherein the positional parameters

Art Unit: 2876

are retrieved from the barcode (col. 3, lines 35+). Since the barcode is affixed on the surface of the cartridge processor 14, it can be said that the surface contributes in determining the scan path.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20 9. Claims 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell et al. (US 6,138,909).

25 Re claims 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30-34, as shown in figure 3, the robot retrieves/deposits a data cartridge relying on positioning the device according to offset value 44, and 45 from the (col. 3, lines 35+). Location of the left edge 46 is stored along with the barcode information (col. 3, lines 49+). Although not explicitly suggested, it is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to store location of right edge, or calculate center/mid point using locations of right and left edges.

Art Unit: 2876

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Melhberg et al. (US 6,721,625); Hashimoto (US 6,671,574); Manes et al. (US 6,643,565); Bosley et al. (US 6,675,063); Manes et al. (US 6,438,448) disclose storage systems such as cartridge library comprising optical reader. Applicant is respectfully suggested to carefully review these references.

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Ahshik Kim* whose telephone number is (571)272-2393. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:00AM to 3:00PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (571)272-2398. The fax number directly to the Examiner is (571)273-2393. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [ahshik.kim@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Ahshik Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2876
May 31, 2005



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800